IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.672 of 2006
IN
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.347 OF 2005

Ramesh Ganpat Mundhe ...Applicant.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra ...Respondent.

....

None for the Applicant.
Mrs.M.M.Deshmukh, APP, for the State.

. . .

CORAM : **SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI, J.**
DATED : **DECEMBER 12, 2006.**
(IN CHAMBER, 2:35 P.M.)

P.C.:

1. None appears for the applicant-original accused No.2. On earlier occasions also i.e. on 10.10.2006, 17.10.2006, 07.11.2006 and 22.11.2006, none appeared for the applicant. Perused the application, the judgment and order and the depositions of witnesses.

2. The applicant is seeking bail. The applicant has been convicted under Section 395 of IPC and sentenced to suffer R.I. for seven years. The applicant had earlier preferred an application for bail which came to be rejected on 20.6.2005. Now the applicant has preferred this fresh application for bail.

3. The applicant has been identified in the test identification parade by PW-5 Minakshi. The evidence of PW-5 Minakshi and other witnesses clearly implicates the applicant. Besides this, the applicant was involved in similar offences i.e. C.R.No.44 of 2002 under Sections 395, 397 IPC of Murbad Police Station, C.R.No.193 of 1998 under Section 392 IPC of Mahatma Phule Police Station, C.R.No.40 of 1999 under Sections 399, 402 IPC of Kolsewadi Police Station, C.R.No.33 of 1999 under Sections 395, 452 IPC of Ulhasnagar Police Station, and C.R.No.188 of 2002 under Section 379 IPC of Bhosari Police Station.

4. The antecedents of the applicant clearly show that he is habitually indulging in offences of similar nature.

5. Looking to the evidence in the present case and the antecedents of the applicant-accused No.2, I do not think that it is a fit case to grant bail. Hence, application for bail is rejected. However, final hearing of the appeal is expedited.

6. Criminal application is disposed of.

(SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.)